

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO But 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.waybo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,715	07/20/2005	Wolfgang Gaschler	12810-00109-US	5738
23416 7590 03/08/2010 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 220	7	-,	HARLAN, ROBERT D	
WILMINGTON, DE 19899			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/542,715	GASCHLER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert D. Harlan	1796	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. Mar her ply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal (e)th oppeal replies) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term ediplication.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____ (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

In the amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (P10L-324).
 In papilicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
 Would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the

non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) | will not be entered, or b) | will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

how the new or amended claims would be rejected in The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: ____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all prejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. \(\overline{\text{Z}}\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \(\overline{\text{See Continuation Sheet.}}\)

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other: .

/Robert D. Harlan/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1796 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains the final rejection. The Examiner asserts MFR is (Mw) x 10 (exp)3.4 and the ethylene-(meth)acrylic polymer disclosed in Nakata has a MFR corresponding to a wax. The Examiner has found no evidence in the accompanying documents to the final rejection that suggest the ethylene-(meth)acrylic are not waxes.